

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,328	07/08/2003	Mykhailo Shribak	34250-55	1371
27799 7590 08/30/2005 COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TU T	
551 FIFTH AV SUITE 1210	551 FIFTH AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10176			2877	
			DATE MAILED: 08/30/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

91

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/616,328	SHRIBAK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tu T. Nguyen	2877				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appreciate for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34 and 40-57</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>35 and 39</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-38</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 May 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to b drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/08/2004 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosencwaig et al (5,596,406) in view of Dreher (2002/0091323) and Kavanagh et al (5,865,520).

With respect to claim 35, Rosencwaig discloses a system for measurement of polarization (column 16, line 17-18). The system comprises: an incident beam 214 (fig 7) of light to be measured; a multiplicity of photodetector regions 446,436 (fig 7) (column 13, lines 42-45); a beamsplitter 420 (fig 7) for splitting the incident light into plural subbeams and for directing each of the plural sub-beams toward a different one of the multiple photodetector regions 436,446 (fig7), a polarizer 530 (fig 8) for preferentially transmitting incident light 214 (fig 8), calculation means 340 (fig 6) for determining polarization state from signal levels generated at the plural photodetector regions onto which the plural sub-beams are directed.

Rosencwaig does not disclose a plurality of polarizers or a beam splitter comprising a single multifaceted optical element. Dreher discloses a system for examining a sample. The system comprise: a plurality of polarizers 62 (fig 3). Kavanagh discloses a multifaceted beamsplitter (figs 4a,4b,4c). It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2877

modify Rosencwaig with a plurality of polarizers taught by Dreher and the multifaceted beamsplitter as taught by Kavanagh to control the polarization states of the divided signals easier.

With respect to claim 39, it would have been obvious a design choice to modify the polarizers as taught by Dreher to preferentially transmit incident light that is substantially circularly polarized and at least another of the plural analyzer polarizers transmit light that is substantially linearly polarized to measure different characteristic of the sample.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-34,40-57 are allowed.

Claims 36-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior arts of record do not disclose plural analyzer polarizers preferentially transmit incident light in preferential incident polarization states corresponding to states within a distance ε of a selected pole on a Poincare sphere as claimed in claims 1,27,36,40.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2424. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 7:30-5:30.

Art Unit: 2877

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Toatley Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 Ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tu T. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 2877

Ounguyen

08/19/2005